

*Do not forget that the industry's leader provided the VP 100 and VP 200 to consumers, free of charge. Smaller VRS providers are quite often providing interpreting services through those very same VP's (video phones). Constant improvements in technology and service delivery are needed for ALL callers - we expect that as hearing people without blackberries, i phones, cells, pagers, and the like. Video Phone users deserve the same progress.

*They, Sorenson, have continued to support having choice of provider, as Deaf people wanted, and have not demanded their equipment back. In the event that these rate cuts are approved - this not only means the leader will likely have no funds to continue technological developments (if business can survive at all with a 40% cut in funding), but it also means that the industry as a whole will remain stagnant. Who is prepared to lead the way in Sorenson's place? What smaller provider has the next generation of technology ready to disperse free of charge to the thousands of callers?

*In my personal experience with deaf family members, I know that when other companies developed technology it has been shortlived, difficult to operate, or expensive for Deaf people to purchase. It is inaccurate when I read through comments and note comments like "Sorenson wants more money." Let us remember that Sorenson is not charging the callers for their equipment, recognizing that high speed internet is expensive enough. Is the FCC going to provide expensive technology for VRS callers if Sorenson is unable to survive the rate cuts? And Sorenson's honest request for fair rates makes sense. What VRS provider in that position would not?

*Let us remember that many of the smaller VRS providers would not be able to provide services if it were not for Sorenson's equipment in consumer's homes. But that is not the only reason Sorenson became the leader in the industry. Sorenson leads the way for many reasons: the best technology, well trained interpreters, continuing education opportunities which they open up to ALL interpreters, and ethical practices (yes every company has its 'bad apples' - as Dorothy Rasmussen expressed in her comment - we cannot punish all for the acts of some, and we cannot assume all are the same - whether they are dishonest deaf folks or dishonest employees).

* Would we punish Chiropractor A for having 3,000 clients and pay Chiropractor B nearly twice the rate for having only 300 clients? Where is fair pay for equal work? As I read through my daughter's social studies book it reminds me of the fights in the past after World War II to establish fair pay. It is embarrassing to have to revisit that basic concept again in 2010.

*A former co worker of mine CL (we worked together at CSDVRS years ago) states in his comments that he feels Sorenson should be punished for their scaring the community. Punishing Sorenson for being honest about how the rates will affect their ability to keep the status quo is ridiculous - honesty is necessary in ethically doing business. CSDVRS itself honestly states on page 2 of 17 in its comments that the rates will be "detrimental to the VRS industry and ultimately a bane to the VRS

consumers".

*My former coworker also implies that VRS as a whole will be fine despite the proposed cuts. Again CSDVRS in their 17 page comment states things like "...does not provide a fair and reasonable return....drastic disparity...deters growth." These comments if you read through them paint a clear picture that whether or not Sorenson as the industry's leader would be able to survive the storm in some shape or form - VRS as we know it will never again be the same - for any provider.

*He is thinking from a small company standpoint. From our mutual experience, he should be well aware of the fact that the rates will be fine for smaller companies, but only if they remain small. He should also know that smaller companies are not prepared to handle the call volume should the leader(s) in the industry go bankrupt. It would be like trying to catch the deluge in a paper cup. Call answer times would not be what they are now and we would be taking a huge step back in time.

*Some people complain Sorenson has a monopoly on the market. Consumers have the right to use other equipment or other providers as they wish. They have chosen to make Sorenson number one! One cannot complain that Sorenson has the largest part of the market when there is no incentive, with the \$3.89 tier, for others to work to that level. Why would my Deaf former coworker complain about the fact his fellow Deaf community members have the right to CHOOSE Sorenson or CSDVRS or ZVRS or Purple or any other company they wish to use? Let us not lose sight of the fact that callers have chosen Sorenson for years for various reasons and made them the leader - if Sprint were your provider and someone penalized them for being the leader in the industry would you not revolt?

*As I scan through the 10,000 comments as of 8:20 pm on May 13, I notice how many people talk about these rates affecting Sorenson. They don't mention other companies, they don't say VRS, they say specifically Sorenson. It is quite evident just how many consumers have chosen, use, and cherish the services they are currently receiving from this company. The proposed rates will of course impact Sorenson the most. I note in one comment a Deaf person threatens this will be the next DPN. Another says (if you sign their written message in ASL it is clear) they feel the deaf community should sue the FCC if they adopt the proposed rates. DPN was the Deaf President Now movement at Gallaudet University. The commenter's reference to this historic event, comparing the FCC's cuts to this event, should emphasize to the FCC just how catastrophic the caller realizes the cuts could be. If you are unfamiliar with DPN - there are books about this to enlighten you as to how serious they see the end results being.